The University of Akron
Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Date: January 3, 2019

TO: Rex Ramsier
Executive VP & Chief Admin Officer

FROM: Linda Subich

SUBJECT: Merit Guidelines

The attached guidelines have been approved by the faculty of the Department of Philosophy on November 26, 2018.

I have approved all attached guidelines and criteria.

If you concur, we ask that you also approve the guidelines and criteria.

Department Chair — Date 1/3/19

Dean Buchtel College of Arts & Sciences — Date 1-4-19

Exec VP & Chief Admin Officer — Date 1-9-19

PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT
Merit Evaluation Criteria

1. The weighting for tenured or tenure-track faculty with a standard load (3/3) will be: Teaching 50%, Research 30%, Service 10%, with a floating 10% that each full-time tenured or probationary faculty member can add to the category of his/her choice. The choice of weights will be submitted with the annual report, and if no other choice is specified, the default weight of Teaching 60%, Research 30%, Service 10% will be used.

   The weighting for NTT faculty with a standard load (4/3) will be: Teaching 65%, Research 15%, Service 10%, with a floating 10% that each full-time NTT faculty member can add to the category of his/her choice. The choice of weights will be submitted with the annual report, and if no other choice is specified, the default weight of Teaching 75%, Research 15%, Service 10% will be used.

   As noted above, faculty may choose the relative weightings for teaching, research, and service that will be used in their annual merit evaluation. However, these weightings may be quite different from their actual load. For example, a tenured faculty member who teaches three courses per semester may feel that he/she is in a particularly good period with regard to research and request that 40% of their merit evaluation be based on research. Hence, there is no implication that their merit weightings will in any way reflect their load. Any full-time faculty member (tenured, tenure-track, or NTT) may request an alternative weighting if there are circumstances under which this is appropriate.

2. The first merit evaluation will cover one prior academic year (2005-2006), and the second evaluation will cover one prior academic year (2006-2007). Thereafter, each evaluation will cover either one prior academic year or the three prior academic years, and the Chair will use the criteria below to calculate an **annual** score for each faculty member **and** a **three-year average** score, automatically using the higher of the two scores for the purposes of merit allocation decisions. (The faculty member may **not** choose a two-year average). (When new faculty are hired, they will be evaluated in the same manner—one prior year for the first two years—until they reach the three-year mark and are in sync with the other faculty).

3. Exceptional situations may occur. For example, in semesters or years when a faculty member is on leave (e.g., PDL or sick leave), he/she will not have taught or performed normal service but may have research to show for merit evaluation for that period. In such cases, when the faculty member is evaluated for merit for that year, under the categories of Teaching and Service he/she will receive either the score of their prior year or their last 3-year average, whichever is higher. If the faculty member is on leave for one semester of the year, then this policy will apply for that semester only and these points will be averaged with the points earned during the other semester(s) of work.

4. Publications will be counted when they appear in print, in accordance with University policy, with the following qualifier: A request can be made for consideration at time of acceptance with appropriate documentation from the publisher acknowledging formal acceptance of the publication and providing the anticipated date the publication will appear in print. If the work is NOT published by the anticipated date provided by the publisher, the faculty member will have the merit points earned for its acceptance deducted from the appropriate year's merit evaluation.

5. Point system: A maximum of 5 points can be accumulated in each category.
   Unsatisfactory = 1
   Satisfactory = 2
   Meritorious = 3
   Outstanding = 4
   Extraordinary = 5

By multiplying the points accumulated in each category by the weight scale selected by the faculty member, the minimum total point value that a faculty member can achieve = 1 and the maximum total point value that a faculty member can achieve = 5.

E.g., if a faculty member selects a 60%, 30%, 10% weight scale and is rated unsatisfactory in every category:
1 x 60% = 0.6
1 x 30% = 0.3
1 x 10% = 0.1
TOTAL = 1.0

E.g., if a faculty member selects a 60%, 30%, 10% weight scale and is rated extraordinary in every category:
5 x 60% = 3.0
5 x 30% = 1.5
5 x 10% = 0.5
TOTAL = 5.0

We start with the assumption that "satisfactory" means that you are satisfying your basic job description, and "unsatisfactory" means you are not. Below we define what satisfactory means for each category, and as long as you meet that standard you get a 2. A faculty member who does not meet that standard is considered "unsatisfactory." Additional points accumulate in each category for anything above and beyond that standard. Note: in Research category you may start at 1 because you do not meet the standard for satisfactory that year, but you may still accumulate additional points to add to that 1. In Teaching and Service categories, however, if you do not meet the standard of satisfactory, then you may not accumulate any additional points.

A. Teaching:

A satisfactory rating means that: 1) you are actually showing up and teaching your assigned classes (absences excused by illness, etc., notwithstanding); 2) you keep reasonable office hours and are otherwise available to students; 3) there are not substantial documented student complaints against you; **and** 4) your minimum average score for student evaluations is 2.9.

A meritorious rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 1 point from the additional points below.

An outstanding rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 2 points from the additional points below.

An extraordinary rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 3 points from the additional points below.

Additional points (if rated 'satisfactory' or above by Chair; no additional points can be earned if rated 'unsatisfactory'):

Course evaluations—

Average Student Evaluation Score for all classes taught	Merit Points Added
3.0	0.125
3.1	0.250
3.2	0.375
3.3	0.500
3.4	0.625
3.5	0.750

3.6	0.875
3.7	1.000
3.8	1.250
4.0	1.375
4.1	1.500
4.2	1.625
4.3	1.750
4.4	1.875
4.5	2.000
4.6	2.125
4.7	2.250
4.8	2.375
4.9 (and above)	2.500

- Honors Project advisor: 0.2-1 pt per student
- Honors Project reader: 0.2-0.5 pt per student
- Supervision of independent studies: 0.5-1 pt per independent study
- Reader on thesis or dissertation committee: 0.5 pt per student
- Attendance at teaching workshops: 0.2 pt per workshop, up to 1 pt
- New course development (i.e., creating a new course not in catalogue): up to 2 pts
- Incorporation of innovative teaching methodologies or new technology: up to 0.5 pt (higher pts for first time incorporation, lower pts for continuing use)
- Teaching load is three different preparations per semester: 0.5 pt per year (0.25 pt. per semester; Honors section counts as different prep)
- Teaching awards: up to 2 pts, depending on award
- Other: up to 2 pts

B. Research:

A satisfactory rating means that you are staying current in the research of your field, actively doing research **and** writing. Evidence of this may be at least one publication or equivalents (as listed under Category III in the Philosophy Department Graduate Faculty Criteria) every five years. (If you start at "unsatisfactory"—1 point—because you have no publications or equivalents yet, you may still accumulate additional points by conference presentations or new publications, etc., that will bring your total to 2 points — "satisfactory").

A meritorious rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 1 point from the additional points below (or started at unsatisfactory and accumulated 2 additional points) For instance, if it has been 6 years since your last publication or equivalents (as listed under Category III in the Philosophy Department Graduate Faculty Criteria), you start at "unsatisfactory"—1 point. But you may accumulate points by conference presentations or new publications, etc., that will give you a total of 3 points — "meritorious."

An outstanding rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 2 points from the additional points below (or started at unsatisfactory and accumulated 3 additional points).

An extraordinary rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 3 points from the additional points below (or started at unsatisfactory and accumulated 4 additional points).

Additional points:

- Philosophical publications:
  - Books (authored, edited, translated, electronic): 1-4 pts for 2 successive years
  - Articles or book chapters: up to 2 pts per article
  - Book reviews: 0.2-1 pt
  - Papers reprinted in new publication: 0.0-0.5 pt
- Presentations at state/regional conferences, colloquia, universities, etc.: up to 1 pt per presentation, maximum 2 pts total
- Presentations at national/international conferences, colloquia, universities, etc.: up to 1.5 pts per presentation, maximum 3 pts total
- Running a scholarly workshop (e.g., NEH summer seminars): 0.5-2 pts
- Refereeing article for philosophical journal: 0.2-0.5 pt
- Editor, co-editor for philosophical journal: 0.5-1 pt
- Writing applications for research grants: 0.2-3 pts
- Award of research grants (e.g., NEH summer seminars with grant funding): 0.2-5 pts
- Other (e.g., presentation of research project to department): 0.0-2 pts

More points will be awarded for higher quality publications, fewer points for lower quality publications. For articles, the primary criterion for determining publication quality will be by acceptance rate for the journal in which the article is published. Journals having an acceptance rate of 25% or lower will be considered highly ranked, journals having an acceptance rate of 50%-26% will be considered middle-ranked, and journals with acceptance rates above 50% will be considered lower ranked. However, since journal ranking is not the only or most reliable indicator of quality, and because we do not wish to discourage publication in Open Access journals (many of which are still becoming established), faculty members may present other evidence supporting a higher ranking for an article (perhaps the article has provoked responses, or has been heavily cited, or was specially commissioned, and so forth).

All the above research must meet the same criteria as specified in our RTP guidelines: "The articles must either be traditional scholarly philosophical publications (appearing in philosophical journals or collections) or works having substantial philosophical content and appearing in interdisciplinary publications, or publications devoted to philosophical pedagogy." This standard for publications also applies to other forms of research activity.

In cases of co-authored work, the faculty member will make the case for the proportion of work for which he/she deserves credit.

Articles appearing in conference proceedings do not count, prima facie, as independent publications, as one receives merit credit for these with the conference presentation.

C. Service to University, College, Department, Community:

A satisfactory rating means that: 1) you regularly attend department meetings and contribute as a member of all necessary department committees (unless excused for legitimate reason); **and** 2) that you take your turn attending graduation. (A pattern of failure to attend the meetings of any committee of which one is a member signals a deficiency in service). NOTE: Membership on a committee does not necessarily constitute service; one must actually perform a service on the committee to warrant merit.

A meritorious rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 1 point from the additional points below.

An outstanding rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 2 points from the additional points below.

An extraordinary rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 3 points from the additional points below.

Additional points (if rated 'satisfactory' or above by Chair; no additional points can be earned if rated 'unsatisfactory'):

- Creation, development and/or running a department internship program: 0.2-4 pts
- Department Committee chair/officer: 0.2-0.5 pt per committee
- College or University Committee member: 0.0-0.5 pt per committee
- College or University Committee chair/officer: 0.2-1 pt per committee
- Executive committee officer of Faculty Senate, Akron-AAUP, etc.: up to 4 pts
- Library liaison, student organization advisor, Akron-AAUP departmental liaison, etc: up to 0.5 pt per position
- Maintaining department website: up to 2 pts
- Discipline related service to community: up to 0.5 pt per activity, maximum 2 pts total
- Representing department at student recruitment event: 0.1 pt per instance, maximum 1 pt total
- Writing peer evaluations: 0.5 pt per instance, maximum 2 pt. total
- Other (e.g., guest speaking for classes or special events): maximum 2 pts

Each of the three categories includes the option of "Other" to cover any relevant work not anticipated in these guidelines. In this and other cases where variable points are available, the faculty member will request the point value he/she believes is fair and explain why (providing documentation).

In all three categories (teaching, research, and service) chair will strive to be consistent in giving faculty members similar points for similar activities, even though faculty may differ in the points they request for similar activities.

6. By a designated date (with at least 2 weeks' notice) each faculty member will submit an annual report to the Chair. This report will include the attached checklist to itemize activities/accomplishments in the categories of Teaching, Research, and Service for the prior academic year, from the first day of the prior period to the last day of the prior period. In cases where variable points are available, the faculty member will request the point value he/she believes is fair and explain why. The faculty member may include any supporting materials considered relevant. The Chair will then evaluate the report, and any other relevant considerations, and make a final point assignment in each category between 1 and 5, using one/tenth gradations (e.g., 3.4 or 3.5). Then the point value for each category will be multiplied by the appropriate weight (e.g., for 60% multiply points by .6), the three resulting numbers will be added, and the final number will be rounded to the nearest one/tenth point (e.g., 3.85 becomes 3.9, and 3.84 becomes 3.8). This final number is the faculty member's final merit score for that year and will be plugged into the merit formula provided in the contract. When multiple years are considered, this is the number that will be averaged with the corresponding totals from other years.

PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT
Checklist to Submit with Annual Report

Name: _____

Year: _____

Weighting scale: Teaching _____% Research _____% Service _____%

In the three categories below, identify all your activities for the prior academic year.

In cases where variable points are available, you should request the point value you believe is fair and explain why (providing documentation).

Attach any supporting materials that you believe are relevant.

Total your points at the end of each category.

Each of the three categories includes the option of "Other" to cover any relevant work not anticipated in these guidelines. In this and other cases, where variable points are available, the faculty member will request the point value he/she believes is fair and explain why (providing documentation), and the chair will decide the final number of points to award in that instance. The chair will strive to be consistent in giving faculty members similar points for similar activities, even though faculty may differ in the points they request for similar activities.

To calculate your final merit score: multiply the total points in each category (between 1 and 5, using one/tenth gradations) by that category's weight, then add these three numbers together, rounding to the nearest one/tenth point (it should be something between 1 and 5).

Teaching Points _____ X Teaching Weight _____ = _____

Research Points _____ X Research Weight _____ = _____

Service Points _____ X Service Weight _____ = _____

Total of these three numbers is FINAL MERIT SCORE = _____

(This is your self evaluation, but remember, the Chair may come up with different numbers depending on various factors).

A. Teaching:

A satisfactory rating means that:
1) you are actually showing up and teaching your assigned classes (absences excused by illness, etc. notwithstanding);
2) you keep reasonable office hours and are otherwise available to students;
3) there are not substantial documented student complaints against you; **and**
4) your minimum average score for student evaluations is 2.9.

Meets the minimal definition of "satisfactory" (yes, mark 2; no, mark 1): ____

Additional points
(if rated 'satisfactory' or above by Chair; no additional points can be earned if rated 'unsatisfactory'):

Course evaluations ____

Average Student Evaluation Score for all classes taught	Merit Points Added
3.0	0.125
3.1	0.250
3.2	0.375
3.3	0.500
3.4	0.625
3.5	0.750
3.6	0.875
3.7	1.000
3.8	1.125
3.9	1.250
4.0	1.375
4.1	1.500
4.2	1.625
4.3	1.750
4.4	1.875
4.5	2.000
4.6	2.125
4.7	2.250
4.8	2.375
4.9 (and above)	2.500

Honors Project advisor: 0.2-1 pt per student ____

Honors Project reader: 0.2-0.5 pt per student ____

Supervision of independent studies: 0.5-1 pt per independent study ____

Reader on thesis or dissertation committee: 0.5 pt per student ____

Attendance at teaching workshops: 0.2 pt per workshop, up to 1 pt _____

New course development (i.e., creating a new course not in catalogue): up to 2 pts _____

Incorporation of innovative teaching methodologies or new technology: up to 0.5 pt (higher pts for first time incorporation, lower pts for continuing use) _____

Teaching load is three different preparations per semester: 0.5 pt per year (0.25 pt. per semester; Honors section counts as different prep) _____

Teaching awards: up to 2 pts, depending on award _____

Other: up to 2 pts _____

TOTAL Teaching Points _____

B. Research:

A satisfactory rating means that you are staying current in the research of your field, actively doing research **and** writing. Evidence of this may be at least one publication or equivalents (as listed under Category III in the Philosophy Department Graduate Faculty Criteria) every five years.

Meets the minimal definition of "satisfactory" (yes, mark 2; no, mark 1) _____

Philosophical publications:

Books (authored, edited, translated, electronic): 1-4 pts for 2 successive years _____

Articles or book chapters: up to 2 pts per article. _____

Book reviews: 0.2-1 pt _____

Papers reprinted in new publication: 0.0-0.5 pt _____

Presentations at state/regional conferences, colloquia, universities, etc.: up to 1 pt. per presentation, maximum 2 pts total _____

Presentations at national/international conferences, colloquia, universities, etc.: up to 1.5 pts per presentation, maximum 3 pts total _____

Running a scholarly workshop (e.g., NEH summer seminars): 0.5-2 pts _____

Refereeing article for philosophical journal: 0.2-0.5 pt _____

Editor, co-editor for philosophical journal: 0.5-1 pt _____

Writing applications for research grants: 0.2-3 pts _____

Award of research grants (e.g., NEH summer seminars with grant funding): 0.2-5 pts _____

Other (e.g., presentation of research project to department): 0.0-2 pts _____

TOTAL Research Points _____

More points will be awarded for higher quality publications, fewer points for lower quality publications. For articles, the primary criterion for determining publication quality will be by acceptance rate for the journal in which the article is published. Journals having an acceptance rate of 25% or lower will be considered highly ranked, journals having an acceptance rate of 50%-26% will be considered middle-ranked, and journals with acceptance rates above 50% will be considered lower ranked. However, since journal ranking is not the only or most reliable indicator of quality, and because we do not wish to discourage publication in Open Access journals (many of which are still becoming established), faculty members may present other evidence supporting a higher ranking for an article (perhaps the article has provoked responses, or has been heavily cited, or was specially commissioned, and so forth).

All the above research must meet the same criteria as specified in our RTP guidelines: "The articles must either be traditional scholarly philosophical publications (appearing in philosophical journals or collections) or works having substantial philosophical content and appearing in interdisciplinary publications, or publications devoted to philosophical pedagogy." This standard for publications also applies to other forms of research activity.

In cases of co-authored work, the faculty member will make the case for the proportion of work for which he/she deserves credit.

Articles appearing in conference proceedings do not count, prima facie, as independent publications, as one receives merit credit for these with the conference presentation.

C. Service to University, College, Department, Community:

A satisfactory rating means that:
1) you regularly attend department meetings and contribute as a member of all necessary department committees (unless excused for legitimate reason);
and
2) you take your turn attending graduation.

A pattern of failure to attend the meetings of any committee of which one is a member signals a deficiency in service.

NOTE: Membership on a committee does not necessarily constitute service. One must actually perform a service on the committee to warrant merit.

Meets the minimal definition of "satisfactory" (yes, mark 2; no, mark 1): _____

Additional points
(if rated 'satisfactory' or above by Chair; no additional points can be earned if rated 'unsatisfactory'):

Creation, development and/or running a department internship program: 0.2-4 pts _____

Department Committee chair/officer: 0.2-0.5 pt per committee _____

College or University Committee member: 0.0-0.5 pt per committee _____

College or University Committee chair/officer: 0.2-1 pt per committee _____

Executive committee officer of Faculty Senate, Akron-AAUP, etc.: up to 4 pts _____

Library liaison, student organization advisor, Akron-AAUP departmental liaison, etc: up to 0.5 pt per position _____

Maintaining department website: up to 2 pts _____

Discipline related service to community: up to 0.5 pt per activity, maximum 2 pts total _____

Representing department at student recruitment event: 0.1 pt per instance, maximum 1 pt. total _____

Writing peer evaluations: 0.5 pt per instance, maximum 2 pt. total _____

Other (e.g., Guest speaking for classes or special events): maximum 2 pts _____

TOTAL Service Points _____

3/6/06
4/18/06 rev.
10/23/06 rev.
1/22/07 rev.
2/15/07 rev.
11/14/13 rev.
11/09/18 rev.